

**MINUTES OF THE ADULTS AND COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD AT 7PM, ON  
TUESDAY 3 MARCH 2020  
BOURGES / VIERSEN ROOM, TOWN HALL, PETERBOROUGH**

**Committee Members Present:** Councillors N. Simons (Chairman), S. Bond, J. Howard, J. Howell, M. Jamil, S. Warren, I. Yasin

**Officers Present:** Adrian Chapman – Service Director, Communities and Partnerships  
Matt Oliver – Head of Think Communities  
Clair George - Head of Prevention and Enforcement Service  
Jawaid Khan - Community Cohesion Manager

**Also Present:** Councillor Irene Walsh – Cabinet Member for Communities

**38. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Aitken, Brown (Councillor Warren in attendance as substitute), Bisby and Fox.

**39. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND WHIPPING DECLARATIONS**

No declarations of interest were received.

**40. MINUTES OF THE ADULTS AND COMMUNITIES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 14 JANUARY 2020**

The minutes of the Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 14 January 2020 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

**41. CALL IN OF ANY CABINET, CABINET MEMBER OR KEY OFFICER DECISIONS**

There were no requests for call in to consider.

**42. PORTFOLIO HOLDER PROGRESS REPORT – COMMUNITIES**

This item was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Communities, accompanied by the Head of Think Communities, the Head of Prevention and Enforcement Service and the Community Cohesion Manager. The report allowed the Committee to scrutinise the work being undertaken under the portfolio of the Cabinet Member for Communities, Councillor Irene Walsh.

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- It was noted Matt Oliver had just been appointed as Head of Think Communities

and had yet to start the role. He was also the current Head of Youth Support.

- Members referred to section 4.7 of the report and asked when the workforce development programme would begin. Officers responded that they wanted place-based coordinators in place, who would be essential for engagement with Members. This was a priority for the Head of Think Communities and greater Member engagement would take place within three months.
- Members asked how the success of Think Communities would be assessed. The Service Director, Communities and Partnerships responded that Think Communities was a movement, not a project or programme, and he would welcome the Committee's support. Think Communities would be based on local plans and councillors would be engaged with in small areas to identify the needs of residents. Officers could potentially report these plans back to the Committee. It was not desirable to provide specific statistical criteria as they might not be realistic or relevant. The aim of the Think Communities was to build plans from the bottom up that were meaningful and relevant and it was hoped Members would engage with this process.
- Members asked what support would be available for parishes in light of the redundancy of the dedicated Community Capacity Officer and Parish Coordinator post. The Cabinet Member responded that the Council would continue to provide support within budgetary constraints, but delivered in a different way. The possibility of a unified approach with Cambridgeshire County Council was being explored. The ideas generated at a recent meeting of the Parish Council Liaison Committee were also being considered. The Service Director, Communities Partnerships added that he could envisage a joint plan with Cambridgeshire with local plans for rural parishes. The support would need to be bespoke and fit for purpose.
- Some members felt that the Council had failed to deal with fly-tipping in hotspot areas effectively. The Head of the Prevention and Enforcement Service Responded that cameras had had been obtained following the work of the Task and Finish Group to Review Fly-Tipping and Waste Policy. Hotspots were being identified and appropriate authorisations sought. Officers could be employed to liaise with the community in hotspot areas, e.g. taking statements and evidence. The Committee would be informed of the outcomes of the use of cameras when they were known.
- Some members felt that language was a barrier for people to use recycling bins correctly and an education programme was needed. The Service Director responded that this was under discussion and the contract with Aragon Direct Services had provision for education. Bin technology was being developed to benefit people. Progress in this area would be reported to the Committee in the next municipal year.
- The PES team was being transformed and now encompassed civil parking officers, four community officers, a senior problem-solving officer, community safety officers and environmental enforcement officers. The initial focus was on the City Centre but the team had the ability to deploy anywhere in the City if required.
- The Cabinet Member emphasised the importance of ward Councillors providing intelligence to the PES team on hotspot areas.
- Members requested that the Head of the Prevention and Enforcement Service provides the committee with a briefing note outlining the levels of fines issued for

fly-tipping out of the 195 fixed penalty notices issued in 2019.

- In response to a Member's concerns, the Service Director commented that there were issues with encouraging witnesses of fly-tipping incidents to have the confidence to give evidence to enable prosecution. The Committee Requested the Service Director, Communities and Safety works with colleagues to support witnesses of fly-tipping incidents to have the confidence to come forward.
- It was possible for Parish Councils to employ PES officers and the Council would always aim to work closely with parishes although the feasibility of this with current resources levels would need to be considered. It was suggested that, unlike the Hampton model in which PCC officers are transferred to the parish, powers could be transferred to parishes to employ their own officers.
- Enforcement officers had started work and recruitment was ongoing.
- Members referred to section 4.9.6 of the reports pack and questioned whether 13 parking officers would be sufficient to deal with parking issues outside schools. The Head of PES responded that three new officers had been employed who would police parking outside schools. Their presence alone would encourage people to park correctly. The Council was engaging with schools and parents on road safety matters to create change. Alternative technological approaches to tackling problem parking, such as cameras, could also be considered. Educating people to work with the Council was as important as enforcement. The Cabinet Member added that she had attended a pupil panel at a school in Stanground which had asked parents to change their behaviour.
- The Head of Think Communities stated that he was keen to integrate local voices with the Council's work as part of the Think Communities approach.
- Members asked if the Council's Think Communities approach was based on a similar initiative in Wigan. The Service Director responded that he was not sure who originally developed the idea. He visited Wigan when their deal was announced and noted how well-informed and enthusiastic the population were about it. A key emphasis was on having a clear division of responsibility between the Council and community leaders; making it clear that people had to take personal responsibility in order to deliver certain services.
- It was noted that a similar deal for Peterborough was being worked on.
- Members requested that the Head of the Prevention and Enforcement Service provides information to Members on the support the Council could provide to schools and residents to tackle problematic parking outside schools.
- All children who were refugees were in school and doing well. Attendance was at 95%. It was recognised that language could be a barrier to attainment. The Council was now experienced in integrating refugees and the next cohort had been prepared for via a Task and Finish Group which included representatives from the Islamic Centre, Kingsgate Church and Care Zone. The Befriending Service also helped to make new residents feel welcome.
- The Committee requested the Cabinet Member for Communities organises a visit for members to the CCTV centre.
- Members referred to section 4.9.6 of the reports pack and suggested that having a single Problem Solving Officer might place considerable pressure on this individual. The Head of PES responded that she did not envisage this officer

working in isolation, but as part of a multi-agency approach which would be closely monitored. Members could support this officer by sharing information.

- It was noted that only 3 adults from the Syrian Refugee Programme were currently in work. Members asked what barriers were preventing this figure from being higher. The Cabinet Member and Community Cohesion Manager responded that there was more than just a language barrier as many of these people had limited literacy. It was a challenge to help them into employment and language was a key part of this. A significant number were volunteering. Officers would continue to evaluate this work during the next cohort of refugees.
- Members referred to section 4.9.6 of the reports pack and suggested that ward councillors could do more to engage with residents regarding the EU settlement scheme. The Community Cohesion Manager responded that 25,000 people had registered on the scheme. It was known that not everyone had registered yet but it was not known how many people this represented. Officers were aiming to take different circumstances into account when engaging with people and would work closely with ward councillors across Cambridgeshire.
- Members felt it was important to know how many E.U citizens lived in Peterborough and noted that those who did not apply for the Settlement Scheme would not have the right to work. It was felt that 25,000 seemed too low and more work needed to be done to connect with people who were harder to reach. The Community Cohesion Manager acknowledged that more work needed to be done. Many organisations needed to be engaged with such as places of worship, schools and hospitals.
- Members suggested that the Council could liaise with landlords and letting agents to identify E.U. Citizens. Officers responded that this was being done. The Council was also identifying specific groups, e.g. looked after children.
- Members suggested that officers could use the electoral roll to help with identifying E.U. Citizens. Officers responded that they would investigate this but the electoral roll did not include ethnicity or nationality data. Community groups were being worked with as they were more familiar with the people concerned. Communication of the Settlement Scheme had been good but some people had held back from registering and the Council was focussed on changing this.

## **ACTIONS AGREED**

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee **RESOLVED** to consider and scrutinise this report and endorse the approach being taken under the portfolio of the Cabinet Member and:

1. Requested that the Head of the Prevention and Enforcement Service provides the committee with a briefing note outlining the levels of fines issued for fly-tipping out of the 195 fixed penalty notices issued in 2019.
2. Requested the Service Director, Communities and Safety works with colleagues to support witnesses of fly-tipping incidents to have the confidence to come forward.
3. Requested that the Head of the Prevention and Enforcement Service provides information to Members on the support the Council could provide to tackle

problematic parking outside schools.

4. Requested the Cabinet Member for Communities organises a visit for members to the CCTV centre.

#### **43. TARGETED YOUTH SUPPORT SERVICE UPDATE**

The report was introduced by the Cabinet Member for Communities and the Head of Think Communities which raised the profile and acknowledged the achievements of the Targeted Youth Support Service (TYSS), informed members of the impact of budget proposals and briefed them on continued inspection preparation.

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee debated the report and in summary, key points raised and responses to questions included:

- Members requested further information on how external funding would be used. Officers responded that this funding was a first for the City and it was acknowledged that engaging with the voluntary sector had been a difficult process. A key part of the bid for funding had been giving young people a voice via youth commissioners.
- The Targeted Youth Support Service (TYSS) had been restructured in a manner that preserved safeguarding. Systems had been kept in place to enable families to move through the system and de-escalate situations.
- Members requested an assessment of how successful an inspection of the TYSS would be, if it were to occur. Officers responded that they were doing everything they could to be properly prepared. There had been significant progress in reducing the number of young people being taken into care and reducing the number of families requiring social care intervention as a result of the work of the TYSS team and the service was in a strong position. This reduction had been achieved by capitalising on people's skills, having services accessible in one place, early identification of those who might need care, plans to bring people out of care and different types of safeguarding for different ages.
- Success stories included Romsey Mill in Hampton, the YMCA and the Princes Trust. Funding was always an issue but there were plans to create a Youth Foundation Partnership for Peterborough via joint funding bids.
- It was noted that the Police and Crime Commissioner had a funding pot for young people. The Council were exploring a joint bid for this alongside Cambridge City Council for a publicity campaign against knife crime and criminal exploitation and to identify the early signs of knife crime. There were also other examples of work with the Police and Crime Commissioner.
- Members noted the good performance of the service in section 4.1.5 of the report and asked if comparisons with the national average were available. Officers responded that the figures were only local and other local authorities were taking similar approaches. The Council did have a higher level of young people in the NEET (not in Education, Employment or Training) category than its statistical neighbours and this had been the case for a while. The Service had maintained its performance despite a 50% reduction in resources.
- Members referred to section 4.2.3 of the report and asked if safeguarding information and training was available for volunteers and how this could be

accessed. Officers responded that more work was required in this area but work was done with volunteers. Free training was offered via the Safeguarding Children Board but sessions were not at convenient times. Safeguarding training was available at the Council's sites and via the National Youth Agency.

- Members suggested that safeguarding training on Saturdays would be useful.

#### **ACTIONS AGREED:**

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to:

1. Review the achievements of the Targeted Youth Support Service during the first 18 months of operation
2. Review the direction of travel for the Targeted Youth Support Service in the context of budgets for 2020/ 2021
3. Note and comment on preparation for HMI Probation Youth Justice Inspection and Ofsted Inspection readiness
4. Endorse Early Help and Adolescent Strategy outcome proposals

#### **44. MONITORING SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Democratic Services Officer introduced the report which enabled the Committee to monitor and track the progress of recommendations made to the Executive or Officers at previous meetings.

It was noted that the Youth Justice Plan 2019-22 had been endorsed by Cabinet on 3 February 2020 and was due to be approved by Council on 4 March 2020.

#### **ACTIONS AGREED:**

The Adults and Communities Scrutiny Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to consider the responses from Cabinet Member and Officers to recommendations made at previous meetings as attached in Appendix 1 to the report.

#### **45. FORWARD PLAN OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS**

The Democratic Services Officer introduced the report which invited Member to consider the most recent version of the Forward Plan of Executive Decisions and identify any relevant items for inclusion within the Committee's work programme or to request further information.

There were no further comments made.

#### **ACTIONS AGREED:**

The Committee considered the report and **RESOLVED** to consider the current Forward Plan of Executive Decisions.

CHAIRMAN

7pm to 8.19pm